

**DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS**  
**Accreditation Study Work Group**  
**Topic, Issues and Options Matrix**

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Purpose of Accreditation  “Accreditation Framework: Introduction to the Framework”	Refine the purpose of accreditation for California’s educator preparation programs, taking into consideration the policy and budget environment in California and nationally. <i>Does the current purpose of the Accreditation system as contained in the introduction of the Accreditation Framework reflect the generally agreed upon purpose(s) of accreditation today?</i>	<del>Continue purposes as defined in Accreditation Framework</del>  Modify definition of purpose of accreditation ** <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose of accreditation: Ensure accountability, Adhere to standards, Ensure high quality and effective preparation programs, Support program improvement</li> <li>• Essential Attributes: Description of the attributes of the implementation accreditation system: <i>Professional Nature, Knowledgeable participants, Breadth and flexibility, Intensity, Efficiency and cost-effectiveness</i></li> </ul>
Role of CTC and COA  “Accreditation Framework: Section 2”	The Commission’s vision statement is “To ensure that those who educate the children of this state are academically and professionally prepared.” One of the Commission’s goals is to: “Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators. “ The COA has responsibility for implementing the accreditation system, while the Commission establishes policies. The COA reports to the Commission on an annual basis.  <i>Do the roles and responsibilities of the Commission and COA under the current accreditation system provide appropriate oversight of teacher education and maximum efficiency?</i>	Continue the roles of the Commission and COA as defined in the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> but improve communication between COA and Commission by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) On-going COA representative reports at Commission meetings as is appropriate, but more frequently than annual reporting. COA will investigate and implement processes that will allow the Commission to better determine how its accreditation policies are being implemented.**</li> <li><del>b) COA information or consent item on the agenda at each Commission meeting, or as appropriate</del></li> </ul> <del>Modify the role of the Commission in accreditation</del> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>e) Commission ratification of accreditation decisions made by COA</del></li> <li><del>d) Eliminate COA, Commission makes all accreditation decisions</del></li> <li><del>e) COA initially accredits institutions instead of the Commission</del></li> </ul>

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Unit Accreditation and Program Approval “Accreditation Framework: Section 6”	Currently California’s accreditation system involves a single accreditation decision for the institution—unit accreditation. The individual programs are approved within the process of coming to the institution’s accreditation decision. <i>Does the current system need to be modified to ensure appropriate attention to both program and unit issues?</i>  <i>NOTE: Draft language out for Stakeholder feedback (11/04)</i>	<del>Continue to accredit the institution with program approval embedded in the single accreditation process.</del>
		<del>Move back to a program approval system without any institution wide accreditation decision</del>
		Develop a new blended system that addresses both unit accreditation AND enhanced program review in a different manner. **
Accreditation Decisions “Accreditation Framework: Section 6”	Current Framework includes three options—Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations and Denial of Accreditation. Current Framework also requires all Stipulations to be cleared within one year. <i>Does this menu of options or the time frame need to be modified in any way?</i>	<del>Continue with the current accreditation options as described in the <i>Accreditation Framework</i></del>
		Modify the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> to more clearly show individual Program Findings and revise the Accreditation findings to include the finding of full accreditation with required follow-up. **
National Unit Accreditation “Accreditation Framework: Section 7”	Current law states that national accreditation of an educational unit may be substituted for state accreditation, if specific conditions are met. Conditions are set forth in the <i>Framework</i> . As the current accreditation system is implemented, national accreditation separate from state accreditation has not taken place in California. <i>How or should National Accreditation of the Education Unit integrate with state accreditation?</i>	Continue national unit accreditation options as defined in Ed Code and <i>Accreditation Framework</i> : agreements and protocols with national accrediting bodies may need to be adjusted to accommodate the revised state accreditation system.**
		<del>Replace California’s accreditation process with national accreditation</del>
		<del>Eliminate national accreditation options</del>
		<del>Modify existing practice...</del>

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
National Program Approval or Accreditation  “Accreditation Framework: Section 7”	Current law states that national accreditation of a specific program may be substituted for state accreditation, if specific conditions are met. Conditions are set forth in the <i>Framework</i> . As the current accreditation system is implemented, national accreditation separate from state accreditation has not taken place in California. <i>How or should National Accreditation of individual Preparation Programs integrate with state accreditation?</i>	Continue national program accreditation options as defined in Ed Code and <i>Accreditation Framework</i> , no change required
		<del>Replace California’s program approval process with national program accreditation or approval</del>
		<del>Eliminate national program options</del>
		All California programs must participate in the California accreditation process. California supports national program accreditation when the national program review can be coordinated with the California process**
Program Standard Options  “Accreditation Framework: Section 3”	Currently, there are five program standard options that institutions may choose among: California Standards, National or Professional Standards, General Standards, Experimental Standards, or Alternative Standards.  <i>Do each of the five current options provide equivalent or adequate standards for accreditation activities? Should the options be modified or changed?</i>	<del>Continue with the current five program standard options</del>
		Provide three program standards options: 1) California Program Standards, 2) National or Professional Program Standards, or 3) Experimental/Alternative Program Standards. If national standards are used, comparability must be established and programs must address the California specific standards in addition to the national standards. **
		<del>Require all institutions to use 1) California or 2) National or Professional Program Standards</del>
		<del>Require all institutions to use 1) California or 2) Experimental/Alternative Program Standards</del>
		<del>Require all institutions to use California Program Standards only</del>
Accreditation as a once every six year event or an on-going activity	Currently the accreditation system examines an institution every six years with a ‘snapshot.’ The COA decides on an accreditation finding and if that finding is Accreditation, the institution does not interact with the COA until the next review in six years. <i>Would an approach that allows historical data to be considered better support the purposes of an accreditation system?</i>	<del>Maintain snapshot approach</del>
		Modify existing system to look at institution over time using historical data and information.*

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Data Collection  “Accreditation Framework: Section 5/6”	Annual, bi-annual, or periodic data collection on programs and/or the unit. Information gathered could be used to inform, and possibly structure, the site visit. <i>What type of data should be collected and analyzed 1) during the site visit, and 2) in an interim activity, or annually? How should the data impact 1) the accreditation decision and 2) the focus of the site visit?</i>  <i>What data will provide information on candidate competence? Unit</i>	Goal for institution to aggregate data, systematically review the data and use the data for program improvement*
		Focus on candidate competence through pre- and post- test, TPA scores, employer survey, candidate self-assessment*
		Each institution submits annually a web based report particularly focused on candidate competence and related assessments. The annual reports are used by next site review team **
		Use of surveys—program completers, employers, IHE faculty to gather appropriate information*
Site Level Activity— Scope and Structure  “Accreditation Framework: Section 5/6”	The current site visit reviews all standards—unit and program—through document review, interviews and a self-study at the institution. <i>What should take place during the site level activity? Could the site level activity benefit from increased use of technology?</i>	<del>Continue with the current site visit as defined in the Accreditation Framework where both unit and program standards are examined.</del>
		Move to a “focused site visit” that reviews only some standards or some programs
		Review the unit through a site visit. Review all programs through annual data collection and document review prior to site activity. Program issues identified during the annual report and document review can also be addressed during the site review.**
Site Level Activity-Frequency  “Accreditation Framework: Section 5/6”	Currently, institutions have a site visit every six years. (NCATE has moved to a seven year cycle with additional interim reporting mechanisms required.) <i>What is the appropriate cycle for the future site level activity?</i>	<del>Continue with the six year cycle as defined in the Accreditation Framework</del>
		Move to a seven year cycle but with annual data collection and an interim activity in the fifth year of the cycle. Develop a plan for immediate intervention if warranted.**
		Set up a system that supports immediate intervention, if warranted
Interim Review Activities  “Accredita-	Information was shared from the BTSA community on the informal peer review process which takes place in between the formal review site visits. The value of these activities for program improvement was emphasized. How can the accreditation system support ongoing program improvement?	Standards based review process that takes place in the interval between the site visits. The process could be focused on the unit or the programs, there are options for institutions, and the activity is required.**

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
tion Framework: Section 5/6''	<i>What type of interim activities—unit or program focused—would support program improvement?</i>	<del>No interim review activity</del>
Multiple Subject- Subject Matter Programs	Subject matter programs are initially approved by a team of readers and there has been no ongoing review of the programs after the initial approval. Multiple Subject Programs can be offered by an IHE to help candidates develop subject matter competence. <i>Should the Multiple Subject subject matter programs be reviewed (on-going review) through the accreditation or some other process?</i>	<del>Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review</del>
		Continue current initial program approval and in addition collect periodic data from programs. Periodic data will focus on the K-12 content standards and focus on program improvement.**
		Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner. *
		<del>Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system.</del>
Single Subject- Subject Matter Programs	Subject matter programs are initially approved by a team of readers and there has been no ongoing review of the programs after the initial approval. Single Subject Programs can be offered by an IHE to satisfy the subject matter requirement. <i>Should the Single Subject subject matter programs be reviewed(on-going review) through the accreditation or some other process?</i>	<del>Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review</del>
		Continue current initial program approval and in addition collect periodic data from programs. Periodic data will focus on the K-12 content standards and focus on program improvement.**
		Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner. *
		<del>Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system</del>
Blended	Blended Programs that are approved by the CTC have submitted a program document that satisfies the six Blended	Continue current initial program approval process with on going review through the accreditation system

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Programs	Program standards. The institution must also have an approved subject matter and teacher preparation program. In addition many institutions have unofficial blended or integrated programs that serve the early decider. <i>Should Blended Programs—approved programs—be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i>	Include approved Blended programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner. ** Still needs further discussion.
5 <sup>th</sup> Year Programs	Prior to SB 2042, the three Fifth Year courses were initially approved with no further review. The SB 2042 Fifth Year Programs are teacher preparation programs offered by institutions that have a Multiple Subject or Single Subject Preliminary Preparation Programs. One institution must recommend the candidate for the SB 2042 Professional Clear Credential as an alternative route to completion of induction. <i>Should 5<sup>th</sup> year programs be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i>	<del>Continue current initial program approval process with no further review</del>
		Include 5 <sup>th</sup> year programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner*
		Include 5 <sup>th</sup> year programs in the accreditation system as other programs*
Induction Programs	There are currently 149 Commission approved Induction Programs. In the past, the BTSA Task Force has implemented a Formal Program Review process to review the BTSA programs on a four year cycle. Now Induction Programs are the preferred path to earn the Professional Clear Credential. <i>Should Induction Programs be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i>	Continue current initial program approval process and ongoing review with Formal Program Review with oversight by the BTSA Task Force
		Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner*
		Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system, BTSA Task Force coordinates the process, and the COA accredits the programs*
Specialized Credential Programs	In addition to Multiple and Single Subject Credentials, the Commission awards credentials in many specialized areas— Special Education, Pupil Personnel Services, Administrative Services, Designated Subjects, and Intern credentials. <i>Should there be any modifications to the accreditation system to support the review of these programs?</i>	Continue with the current program review system as defined in the <i>Accreditation Framework</i>
		Modify the current program review system in relation to the specialized credential programs

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
2042 Required Elements	Prior to SB 2042, the standards had “Factors to Consider” and the review teams were guided by the factors. The 2042 Standards (subject matter, teacher prep, induction and 5 <sup>th</sup> year) have “Required Elements” and the reviewers are asked to hold the institution accountable for every element.	A concern has been expressed that the ‘required elements’ may be too prescriptive and contrary to efforts to move towards an outcomes-based model. Recommend that the Commission bring together stakeholders to carefully examine the 2042 standards and evaluate and consider whether and where changes are needed relative to the concept of ‘required elements’ versus ‘factors to consider’ or adoption of similar terminology that allows for greater institutional flexibility in meeting the standards.**
		<del>Recommend that the “Required Elements” in the SB 2042 Standards be revised to “Factors to Consider” in keeping with the attribute of flexibility in the accreditation system</del>
		<del>No change to the current system, maintain Required Elements</del>
BIR Training		Yet to be addressed.
Selection of COA members  “Accreditation Framework: Section 2”	The current selection process for COA members is cumbersome and costly. <i>Can the selection process be simplified, still meet the requirements of the Education Code, and support the selection of quality COA members?</i>	Keep current process with no modifications
		Modify the selection process to reduce costs, prevent large turnover of COA members in the same year, streamline the nominating panel process.*
Certificate Programs	Certificate programs (CLAD/BCLAD, Early Childhood for example) have not previously been a part of the accreditation system, although Reading is now a part of accreditation. <i>Should all certificate programs be reviewed through the accreditation system process?</i>	<del>Continue to approve certificate programs with no on-going program approval</del>
		Review certificate programs through the accreditation system in addition to the original program approval process.**

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Designated Subjects Programs	Institutions of higher education and local education agencies may both offer designated subjects credential programs. Both types of programs are initially reviewed by a panel for initial program approval. Currently, only the IHE programs are reviewed through the accreditation system. <i>Should LEA sponsored designated subjects programs be reviewed through the accreditation system?</i>	<del>Continue the initial program approval process for designated subject programs. Only the IHE sponsored programs are reviewed through the accreditation system.</del>
		Continue the initial program approval process for designated subject programs. Both IHE and LEA sponsored programs are reviewed through the accreditation system. **
Use of Technology		
Composition of Review Teams		
Experimental Program Standards	An institution may submit a program designed to meet the Experimental Program standards. These standards were approved in 1988. <i>Should the Experimental Program Standards be reviewed and revised?</i>	<del>Continue to use the currently approved Experimental Program Standards</del>
		Recommend to the Commission that a group be convened to review and suggest revisions to the Experimental Program Standards *